



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Evidence of Greek Papyri with regard to Textual Criticism.

By F. G. KENYON. Reprint from the *Proceedings of the British Academy*, Vol. I, 1904. London: Henry Frowde. Pp. 28. 2s.

This important paper, written by a widely known and highly esteemed scholar, deserves special attention. The age in which we live is remarkable for great discoveries in the field of classical philology, among which those of fresh authors or books are of course most prominent, then those of fragments from authors whose works are still lost; but the remainder also is by no means unimportant. Who would ever have imagined that fragments of the *Phaëdo* hardly one century later than the book itself would come to light? Who could have thought of the discovery of Homeric fragments dating from the third century B.C., and consequently older than the Alexandrian recension? The history of the classic Greek texts has now been extended in a way nobody dreamt of half a century ago. The paper of which we shall speak contains a succinct and lucid, and yet in no wise superficial, review of the principal results obtained by the help of the papyri concerning the text of extant Greek authors down to the year 1903.¹ Since that date fresh stores have come in, and while I write others are coming, in large measure due to the praiseworthy and inexhaustible energy of Dr. Grenfell and Dr. Hunt. The British Museum seems to have ceased to acquire papyri, and Dr. Kenyon's activity, most wonderful in former years, is at present unemployed for publishing. Let us hope that the time will come when he is unable to make retrospects like this on account of fresh work being put into his hands.

Dr. Kenyon counts no less than 189 papyri of extant authors; that is to say, not MSS, but (with some rare exceptions) fragments of MSS and very frequently small fragments. Therefore the principle *ex ungue leonem* should hold good, and does to some extent. Again, out of the 189 papyri no less than 109 contain portions of Homer, 79 of the *Iliad* and 22 of the *Odyssey*—the rest giving scholia. The dominant position of Homer in classical antiquity cannot be better illustrated than by these statistics, nor the prominence of the *Iliad* in general estimation as over against the *Odyssey*. Dr. Kenyon divides the Homer papyri into

¹In an appendix (pp. 27 f.) the author briefly surveys the results of what is contained in *Oxyrh. Pap.* IV (1904). The number of papyri, especially of Homer, is again greatly increased; the general conclusion, however, remains the same.

two classes, those earlier than the Alexandrian recension (or at any rate untouched by it), of which he counts only four, and the great bulk of more recent MSS, which give substantially the same text as our parchment MSS. The small number of the former class is noticeably increased by Grenfell and Hunt's volume of the present year, the *Hibeh Papyri*. What the author says on the character of this class is on the whole confirmed by the fresh evidence: these papyri abound in spurious verses, not received and (so far as we know) not even mentioned by the Alexandrian critics. Generally these verses are new only in their new context. It is a widespread phenomenon in the tradition of Homer that rhapsodists (or whoever they were) expanded a passage by means of another similar to it, making identical what originally was but similar. We now see that the extent of this kind of deformation was once still greater. But there is among the Hibeh papyri one of a different character (No. 20), which has but one addition and several omissions, and in one of the latter shows a remarkable agreement with Zenodotus, Δ 86 ff. Athene is said to have come among the Trojans in the shape of a man, Laodocus, a son of Antenor, Πάνδαρον ἀντίθεον διζήμενη, εἴ που ἐφεύροι (88). εὔρε Λυκάονος νῖδον ἀμύμονά τε κρατερόν τε (89) ἑσταότ' ἀμφὶ δέ μιν κρατερὰὶ στίχες ἀσπιστῶν (90) λαῶν, κτέ. The scholia A give as Zenodotus' reading εὔρε δὲ τόνδε instead of εἴ που ἐφεύροι 88, then ἑσταότ' κτέ. 90, without 89, and the same is the reading of the papyrus: διζήμενη ἦρε δ[ε] τ[ονδε] (or perhaps τόν γε, for τόνδε is out of place here); then . . . στίχες ἀσπιστῶν κτέ. There is no question that the papyrus depends upon Zenodotus, and it follows that the latter, although in other cases guilty of wilful shortening, in this case had his authorities. Now the same verses recur E 168 f., of Aeneas: Πάνδαρον ἀντίθεον διζήμενος, εἴ που ἐφεύροι. εὔρε . . . κρατερόν τε. In my opinion there can be no doubt that Zenodotus and the papyrus are right: the passage in Δ has suffered by further assimilation to that in E. Εἴ που ἐφεύροι implies the possibility of not finding, which did exist in the case of Aeneas, but would not have existed even if the real Laodocus and not the goddess had been seeking. In E there is battle and movement; in Δ the armies stand in quiet order.

Out of the other class of papyri Dr. Kenyon selects nine of the *Iliad* and two of the *Odyssey*, and by brief extracts of their peculiar readings shows that they give substantially the same text as our mediaeval MSS. Moreover, if the latter are divided into different families, the papyri show themselves quite impartial regarding the differences between them, the origin of which is thus proved to be of later date. Broadly speaking, we may say that what exists in our MSS already existed in the second century of our era or even earlier. But nevertheless the papyri have their value; for the general truth which I have just stated cannot be inverted. Not all that existed in second-century MSS has come down to us, not even for the *Iliad* and much less for the *Odyssey*. And even if a special

reading has been preserved in one or two MSS, it is by no means useless to know that it is really ancient, and that for instance the omission of a verse in a later MS is not due to mere chance. The Harris Homer (*Brit. Mus. Pap.* 107), containing the greater part of Σ, omits vss. 200, 201, which are omitted also by Cureton's Syriac palimpsest, but (at least vs. 200) nowhere else. Iris is speaking to Achilles: ἀλλ' αὐτως ἐπὶ τάφρον ἰὼν Τρώεσσι φάνηθι (198), αἶ κέ σ' ὑποδείσαντες ἀπόσχονται πολέμοιο (199, cf. Π 41: αἶ κέ με σοὶ ἴσκοντες ἀπόσχονται πολέμοιο) Τρῶες, ἀναπνεύσωσι δ' Ἀργῆιοι νῆες Ἀχαιῶν (200=Π 42) τειρόμενοι, ὀλίγη δέ τ' ἀνάπνευσις πολέμοιο (201=Π 43). The last two lines are apt in Π but out of place in Σ, where the only object to be gained is the final saving of Patroclus' body, which at the same time would be the end of (and not a pause in) the combat of the day. It may be supposed that the Alexandrian critics obelized the verses and that our scholia (as in many cases) are incomplete. Z 493: πᾶσιν, ἐμοὶ δὲ μάλιστα, τοῖ Ἰλῖφι ἐγγεγάασιν. Since the *φ* of Ἰλιος is violated, Hoffmann proposed to write πᾶσι, μάλιστα δ' ἐμοί, (τοῖ Ἰλῖφι) = α 359, φ 350, and Bekker adopted that reading, which is confirmed by a quotation in Arrian *Diss. Epict.* iii. 22. 108. The same is represented by the papyrus MS Oxyrhynchus 425 (*Ox. Pap.* III), and why should it not have been in Aristarchus' text? This corruption *may* be later. A similar case is Ψ 198: ὤκεία δ' Ἴρις MSS, again with violation of the *φ*; ὤκα δὲ Ἴρις, conjectured by Nauck, is the reading of a papyrus (*Grenfell Pap.*, Sec. Ser., No. iv, p. 10); but that papyrus belongs to the older class.¹ Accordingly it is possible to make a conjecture in Homer and afterward to have the pleasure of seeing it confirmed by a papyrus.

From Homer Dr. Kenyon goes on to Hesiod, of whom he counts but four papyri. The results for this poet are of comparatively greater importance than for Homer, since the Alexandrian text of him is very imperfectly preserved. In one case fragments of four new lines (before *Erga* 174) are given by a papyrus of the fourth century A.D., probably spurious lines condemned by the ancients. The next case, that of Solon, is quite an exceptional one: we have no parchment MS of Solon's works, nor has any papyrus MS of them come to light; but there are quotations of Solonian verses existing in Aristides the rhetor and elsewhere, and part of these are given also by the papyrus of the *Πολιτεία*, with notable improvements. The author passes on to the dramatists, among whom Euripides is especially concerned. Here the fact of the substantial identity of the later and the earlier text is again duly stated. There are some exceptions of course; but we see that the copyists who did their

¹ I may correct some slight errors in Dr. Kenyon's extracts from the papyri. *Pap. Brit. Mus.* 136: Δ 378 δὲ for βα with AGTN etc., not "with a few later MSS."—542 ἐλοῖσ' αὐτὰρ as AG.—*Brit. Mus. Pap.* 128: Ψ 427 εὐρυτέρῃ παρελάσσαι, see scholia V.—*Ox. Pap.* 223; E 75, 126 first omitted but afterward supplied.—*Tebtunis Pap.* 4; B 206 omitted as in A etc.,—*Brit. Mus. Pap.* 114; Ω 344 first omitted but afterward supplied.—*Brit. Mus. Pap.* 271 has the dipole eight times, not the obelus.

work in Homer with exactness and reliability did not copy tragedies in a different way. The ardor for introducing conjectural corrections into the tragic poets had already diminished before these discoveries; let us hope that it will go on diminishing—that is to say, to a certain extent; for there are, here too, *certi denique fines*. Byzantine copyists have not done any great harm to these texts; but a guarantee for Alexandrian and Attic copyists has still to be found.

Coming to prose writers, Dr. Kenyon has little to say about Herodotus, who is but poorly represented by papyri, but much more about Thucydides and still more about Xenophon. Of Thucydides there existed a MS in Oxyrhynchus, of the fourth book. The first fragments of it were published in the first volume of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, and others newly found in the fourth (see Appendix, p. 27). We see from these fragments that even in antiquity one MS frequently exhibited different texts—by means of adscripts, many of which are indicated as traditional various readings by double points and horizontal strokes, in this way: τ·ον· with ωι over ον, στα·δια· with δαωι over δια, or απη·ε·σαν without anything over ε, = “ἀπήεσαν or ἀπήσαν.” The same system is found in the Aristotle papyrus and even in the Mediceus of Aeschylus and Sophocles. But Dr. Kenyon rightly remarks that most of these variants are of small importance, and that very little support is given to modern theories which suppose a far-reaching corruption of Thucydides’ text through explanations erroneously incorporated into it. At any rate, the corruption must be older than the first century A. D., the date of this papyrus. That at that time there were already corruptions is proved by iv. 34. 1, where Dobree’s emendation τοῦ θαρσύν τὸ πιστόν, instead of τ. θ. τὸ πλείστον, although not confirmed by the papyrus, must nevertheless be considered certain. Moreover, the papyri themselves show that many roughnesses of Thucydides’ style are in reality due not to the author but to copyists—a useful lesson for editors, many of whom incline to superstitious veneration of manuscript authority, involving prejudice for the author himself. In iv. 37. 1 the parchment MSS all alike give this reading: γνούς δὲ ὁ Κλέων καὶ ὁ Δημοσθένης ὅτι εἰ καὶ ὅπως οὐν μᾶλλον ἐνδύσονται, διαφθαρσομένους αὐτούς. It was not very difficult to remove the inappropriate ὅτι, but nevertheless the particle and the gross anacoluthon were religiously preserved in the texts, until, after the discovery of the papyrus (which omits ὅτι), it disappeared from that of Hude. The general axiom that there are anacolutha in Thucydides, and that his style is rather rough than smooth, must not be stretched too far. In Xenophon’s case the chief lesson is the distrust due to the so-called stemmata of MSS as a basis for the constitution of his text. Both the division into classes and the general estimation of one class as over against another may be correct; but we now see, as we saw for Homer, that in more ancient times that division did not yet exist, while the single readings

both of A and of B did exist, only in different combinations. Except in the rare case that one extant MS is the parent of all others, eclecticism with regard to the different classes is the only safe principle, more and more acknowledged in recent times, while previously the exclusive veneration of one MS, called the best, produced much mischief. Xenophon's text is but indifferently preserved, at least in the *Anabasis* and the *Cyropaedia*: witness the very large number of various MSS readings, much larger than in Thucydides, still further augmented by the papyri.

Coming to Plato, Dr. Kenyon has to deal with fragmentary MSS of the very highest antiquity, discovered among the Flinders Petrie papyri and published, by J. P. Mahaffy, as early as 1891 (1893). In this one case I rather strongly dissent from our author, who, after discussing the evidence of the *Phaedo* papyrus (which is more considerable in extent than the other, that of the *Laches*), says that "the new readings seem to point, just as the earliest papyri of Homer do, to the existence of a certain amount of license in copyists of the early Ptolemaic period." Dr. Kenyon seems to forget, firstly, that these copyists of Homer were still very remote from Homer, whilst those of the *Phaedo* and *Laches* were quite near to Plato (later, perhaps, by one century), and secondly, that after that age there came for Homer a critical reformation, carried through by the best grammarians, while for Plato we know of nothing of the sort. Professor Usener's brilliant conception that Plato's original text came forth after that time from the cellar in Scepsis and formed an authentic basis on which our own parchment MSS rest, necessarily failed to convince, because one hypothesis had been built upon another, and of real proofs there was nothing. The most interesting variant is *Phaed.* 68 *e*, ἀνδραποδώδῃ instead of εὐήθη. The passage runs thus: ἀλλ' ὅμως αὐτοῖς συμβαίνει τούτῳ (P wrongly τουτο) ὅμοιον τὸ πάθος τὸ περὶ ταύτην (τοι ἐπ αὐτην again wrongly P) τὴν εὐήθη (ἀνδραποδώδῃ) σωφροσύνην. It is quite true that the first two variants (and many others besides) prove the faultiness of P, but εὐήθη gives no clear sense, and ἀνδραποδώδῃ the very best sense, being in harmony with 69 *b* τῷ ὄντι ἀνδραποδώδης (where τῷ ὄντι refers to 68 *e*, just as 69 *bc* τῷ ὄντι ἡ καθαρὸς to 67 *ab*, and 80 *e* τῷ ὄντι τεθνάναι μελετώσα to 64 *a*, 67 *e*). It is a mere sophism to say (with Usener and others) that because of 69 *b* ἀνδραποδώδης was interpolated in the former passage. Moreover, Dr. W. Janell produced a second witness for ἀνδραποδώδης, schol. *Phaedr.* 258 *e* ἀνδραποδώδεις εἰσὶν ἡδοναὶ αἱ ἄλλων παθῶν ἀπεχόμεναι, ὑπ' ἄλλων δὲ κρατούμεναι (see the following words in the *Phaedo*). On the other hand, a rhythmical analysis of the passage as it stands in our MSS (with one exception), gives quite a satisfactory result, and ἀνδραποδώδῃ, by this severest test, is not with equal facility justified. In my book on Attic rhythms (Leipzig, Teubner, 1901) and in that on Asianic rhythms (Leipzig, Deichert, 1905, where I have considerably improved the method) I have laid down the principles of

this analysis and applied it to Plato as well as to the orators. τί δ' οἱ κόσμοι αὐτῶν; οὐ | ταῦτ' οὗτο πεπόνθασιν; | (a a, = -- ~ ~ -- =) ἀκολασία τι | νὶ σὺ φρονέες εἰσιν; | (b b, ~ = ~ ~ -- =) καίτοι φαμέν γε ἀδυνατεῖν (MSS ἀδύνατον εἶναι; what P had is uncertain), ἀλλ' ὅμως | (c), αὐτοῖς συμβαίνει τούτῳ ὅμοι- | (d) - ον τὸ πάθος | τὸ περὶ ταύ- | (e e, = ~ ~ --) - την τὴν εὐήθη σωφροσύνην | (d, - - - - - ~ ~ -)· φοβούμενοι γὰρ ἐτέρων ἡδονῶν | (c, = ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~) στερηθῆναι καὶ ἐπιθυμοῦν | τες ἐκείνων, ἄλλων ἀπέχονθ' ὑπ' | (f f, (~) ~ - - - - ~ ~ ~ ~ ~) ἄλλων κρατούμενοι. | καίτοι καλοῦσι γ' α - | (g g, - ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~) -κολασίαν | τὸ ὑπὸ τῶν | (again e e) ἡδονῶν ἄρχεσθαι· | ἀλλ' ὅμως συμβαίνει | (h h, ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~) αὐτοῖς κρατούμενοις | ὑφ' ἡδονῶν κρατεῖν | (again g g, = ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~) κτέ. Over against this P has σωφρονούσιν for σὺ φρονέες εἰσιν, without rhythm, but after that, if we preserve ἀδύνατον εἶναι and instead of τὸ πάθος τοι ἐπ' αὐτὴν read τοι τὸ πάθος περὶ ταύτην, an analysis is possible: καίτοι φαμέν γ' ἀδύνατον | (a) εἶναι, ἀλλ' ὅμως αὐ- | (β) - τοῖς συμβαίνει τούτῳ ὁμοίον τοι τὸ πάθος | (γ) περὶ ταύτην τὴν ἀνδραποδώδη σωφροσύνην | (γ)· φοβούμενοι γὰρ ἐτέρων | (α) ἡδονῶν στερηθῆ - | (β) - ναι καὶ ἐπιθυμοῦντες ἐκείνων | (δ), ἄλλων ἀπέχονται ὑπ' ἐκείνων (so P) | (δ) κρατούμενοι | (ε). καίτοι καλοῦ - | (ε) - σι γ' ἀκολασίαν τὸ ὑπὸ τῶν ἡ - | (δ) - δονῶν ἄρχεσθαι | (ζ)· συμβαίνει δ' οὖν (so P) αὐ - | (ζ) - τοῖς κρατουμένοις ὑφ' ἡδονῶν κρατεῖν ἄλ | (λων) η η . α is ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~, β ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~, γ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~, ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~, δ ~ (or ~ ~) ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~, ε ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~, ζ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~, η (=β) ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~. I have kept the readings of P, except τοῦτο, ἐπ' αὐτὴν and στερηθῆναι ἐτέρων ἡδονῶν, which may be slips of the copyist. If, then, an analysis is possible both ways, we are led to the hypothesis that these differences originate with the author himself, who had made a double edition of this dialogue. It is but just to confess that, as ἀνδραποδώδη cannot be an interpolation, so εὐήθη can hardly be explained in that way. Plato might have thought that ἀνδραποδώδης was rather strong, and might have blunted the edge by substituting an ironical εὐήθης. That he did not cease to remodel his dialogues is attested by Dionysius *De comp.*, p. 208, and that the *Phaedo* had not lost its interest for its author is very likely, while for a dialogue like the *Laches* the same hypothesis would look much more improbable. But there is no need of it for the *Laches*, because there the divergencies between the papyrus and our tradition do not extend quite so far. I have treated this question in two articles, which appeared in *Berichte d. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. zu Leipzig*, 1898, 1899 ("Zur ältesten Geschichte des platonischen Textes"). Blunders are not wanting in the *Laches* papyrus, but on the whole it gives a better text than our MSS, and more than one correction furnished by it is convincing. Badham had suspected τὸ ἐκείνων 191 b as interpolated, and P omits not only these words but also the corresponding τό γε τῶν Ἑλλήνων. In the next line P gives τούτους for Λακεδαιμονίους, which is again an interpolation: πλὴν . . . τὸ Λακεδαιμονίων· τούτους γὰρ—that is to say, Λακεδαι-

μονίους, which was added above the the line and subsequently crept into the text, expelling the pronoun. Of course, the textual condition of the individual dialogues cannot be throughout the same; but that of the *Laches* appears to be indifferent. We have another papyrus fragment of this dialogue, from Oxyrhynchus, of the second century A. D. (*Oxyrh. Pap.* 228), and on 297 c οὐκουν σέ γε P (for οὐκουν ἔγωγε MSS) von Wilamowitz remarks that we ought to be ashamed not to have found this by ourselves. Other Plato papyri repeat the lesson taught by other papyri for other authors—that our text goes back at least as far as the second century A. D., most of all the large (but unluckily worthless) Berlin papyrus containing a commentary on the *Theaetetus* with many quotations from the text.

Dr. Kenyon's survey of the authors concerned concludes with the orators: Isocrates, Aeschines, Demosthenes. That the textual condition of all these is far from being excellent might be gathered from the very large number of variants presented by our MSS. The number of papyri is exceedingly high for Demosthenes, but most of them are of small extent, with the exception especially of one, which at the same time is the oldest of all (first century B. C.), giving the greater part of the third *Epistle* (§§ 1-38). Dr. Kenyon freely avows the superiority of this papyrus over the later MSS, but justly remarks that the case of the epistles may be exceptional, since they were not so much cared for as the orations. Nevertheless, a variant like that in § 13 ὑμεῖς δ' ἐν παρρησίᾳ ζῶντες (P), over against ὑμεῖς δ' ὄντες Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ παιδείας μετέχοντες (MSS), is likely to cause general uneasiness about our tradition. But it is to be remembered that orators were in a different case both from philosophers and from historians. Since the study of eloquence was so general in later antiquity and the Attic masterpieces were constantly explained to disciples, it is no wonder that their text suffered more. The words ὑμεῖς δ' ὄντες Ἀθηναῖοι come from xxiii. 109 (or else from xviii. 68 ἡμῖν δ' οὖσι Ἀθηναίους καὶ . . .); the παιδεία is mentioned in this epistle, § 11. On the other hand, the bulk of the Demosthenes papyri (including the lemmata in the newly found commentary by Didymus) gives the same results for this author which we met with elsewhere: our tradition goes back to the second century of our era; Byzantine copyists are not to be made responsible for any interpolation; the so-called inferior MSS are not to be wholly disregarded.¹ There is no need to enter into more details, nor to repeat the same general facts with reference to Isocrates and Aeschines. Of the latter we have only small fragments, which now and then furnish a good emendation; Isocrates is more fortunate, especially for the big London papyrus of *De pace* (viii), an exact copy of which is given by H. J. Bell in the *Journal of Philology* XXX. This

¹On Demosthenes papyri I have written two short articles, inserted in Fleckeisen's *Jahrb. f. Class. Phil.*, 1892, pp. 29-44, and 1894, pp. 441-50.

papyrus carries us back to the first century of our era and teaches the same lessons.

Now what course is to be followed by future editors, in view of this great enlargement of our knowledge of the history of the texts? We must be more modest in our pretensions, that is clear. As it is easy in some cases to discover the true reading when it is presented by a MS, so it is difficult or rather impossible to do the same throughout a text. I have some confidence in rhythmical analysis, which has the same value for prose writers as the metre or the strophical correspondence for poets. But is that correspondence sufficient to restore the choral songs of the dramatists? By no means. Nevertheless, progress is possible. Dr. Kenyon insists upon the insufficiency of conjectural emendation, and I did the same a dozen years ago; but that insufficiency is apparent only when we look upon the whole of a text, not when we confine our view to a single passage. A good many conjectures have been found subsequent confirmation by the papyri; but it is true that their number is small compared with that of extant corruptions, and also with that of emendations furnished by fresh evidence. So I would advise an editor, first of all, not to rely upon a single MS, secondly, to distrust his own power of conjectural emendation, and lastly, to acquire a thorough acquaintance with his author, that is to say, with his way of thinking, with his modes of expression, with his stylistic rules, and so on. But without common-sense no good edition of any author is possible. Common-sense must guard the editor from snares into which his other criteria frequently may lead him.

F. BLASS

HALLE

Topographie von Athen. Von WALTHER JUDEICH. Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, herausgegeben von Iwan von Müller, III. Bd., 2te Abt., 2te Hfte. München: Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1905. Pp. xii+416. M. 18.

The short sketch of the topography of Athens in Lolling's *Geography of Greece*, published in 1889 in the third volume of this series, is now superseded by a volume of 400 pages. One can only be glad of this increase in size, for it has enabled the author to give us a complete and scientific guide to the monuments of Athens, taking account of the recent discoveries and the recent literature on the subject. This has been accomplished in what is really a very small space by relegating to the foot-notes the discussion of disputed points, while the text gives a statement of the facts with the interpretation of them which the author adopts.

After an introduction (pp. 1-39) giving a clear account of the sources, and a section on the history of the city (pp. 40-106), comes the topography